

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING**

3 **Tuesday, April 23, 2020**

4 **6:00 p.m.**

5 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Work Room**

6 **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**

7 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
8

9 **Members Present:** Chair Scott Peters, Adam Breen, Jonathan Oldroyd, Neils Valentiner,
10 Scott Henriksen, Steve Harman

11
12 **Staff Present:** Community Development Director Mike Johnson, Planner Andrew
13 Hulka, City Planner Matt Taylor, City Recorder Paula Melgar ,
14

15 **BUSINESS MEETING**

16
17 Chair Scott Peters called the meeting to order at approximately 6:11 p.m.
18

19 **1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements.**

20
21 **1.1 Ex-Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**
22

23 There were no ex-parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.
24

25 **2.0 Discussion Items**

26
27 **2.1 (Project SPL-29-003) Action on a Request by Triton Investments for Approval**
28 **of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a New Monument Sign at 6942 South**
29 **Boulder Drive (Boulder Hollow Apartments).**
30

31 Planner, Andrew Hulka presented the staff report and stated that the request is from Triton
32 Investments for approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a new monument sign located
33 at 6942 South Boulder Drive. The proposed sign is slightly smaller in area than the existing sign.
34 The original application included blue letters with black paint on the frame. It was updated to
35 reflect a change to light grey and dark grey with an aluminum frame. Staff recommended approval.
36

37 Blake Anderson from signsslc.com described the proposed signage and stated that the stucco will
38 not continue to the full sides of the base. The cement slab will be larger than the actual dimensions
39 of the sign both in width and depth.
40

41 *Commissioner Oldroyd moved to approve Project SPL-29-003. Commissioner Harman*
42 *seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*
43

44 **2.2 (Project PDD-19-001) Recommendation to the Planning Commission on a**
45 **Request by Wasatch Rock, LLC for a Proposed Planned Development District**

Preliminary Plan and Rezone Application for the Redevelopment of approximately 21.7 Acres at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard.

Senior City Planner, Matt Taylor presented the staff report and stated that the subject property is currently zoned forestry and is a part of the PDD Overlay District. As a part of the rezoning request, the applicant is required to have an adopted ordinance. Mr. Taylor identified several site constraints including fault lines and a high-pressure water pipeline. He explained that the final fault line study conclusions are pending. The applicant has been responsive in redesigning the site to address concerns and comments shared by the Architectural Review Committee and staff. A site map of the property was reviewed.

The creation of common space was proposed. Several items of concern were addressed by turning buildings inward toward the plaza space. Additional changes were also made to the street design including two roundabouts to create angled parking. Mr. Taylor stated that the City's Public Works Department is willing to work with staff to create a new standard for the area that meets the engineering design criteria. He believed that direction can be accommodated along with the addition to an updated traffic study regarding volume not only for the proposed project but for the entire gravel pit redevelopment area.

A cross-section of the site was presented for Upper Wasatch Drive as well as the plaza space between retail Pad A and park space running through the water pipeline easement. The proposed condominium building was revised substantially from a tower with five levels of parking to a broader base including more residential units. Final geologic fault issues were still needed. Staff requested the recommendation of an ordinance to regulate a New Zoning Code that will guide the development of the project. Mr. Taylor stressed the need for supplemental design standards that will guide future ARC decisions on individual phases and projects. The applicant was asked to submit a final supplemental design package that includes the preliminary plan, design themes, and preliminary elevations.

In response to a question raised regarding the guidelines being City iterated zoning, Mr. Taylor explained that a City guideline book was included as an attachment to the staff report. Staff suggested that a supplemental set of design guidelines be adopted as part of a zoning ordinance to regulate the site. He believed the site will develop over seven or eight phases in a period of five to 15 years and encouraged cohesion as development takes place.

Community Development Director, Michael Johnson explained that the intent of the design guidelines was to a consistent design theme and a package that is specific to the proposed site as future phases are developed.

Mr. Taylor state that part of the PDD process includes the adoption of an ordinance that will require a Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council who will grant the final approval. He clarified that policy guidance originates from the General Plan. Staff considers whether a zone change will be approved. At a minimum, the City should have a recommendation that the master site plan meets the policy recommendation.

1 Adam Davis from the Rockworth Companies summarized the previous ARC meeting outlining
2 design guidelines and feedback. Concerns were expressed regarding pedestrian connectivity,
3 turning the site inward, and creating a more urban residential feel along Wasatch Boulevard. He
4 believed they addressed those issues and felt that the site plan had since been enhanced. The new
5 plan included three additional entry points for the gravel pit from the south and created a more
6 pedestrian-friendly plan along Upper Wasatch Boulevard. Circulation and the plaza area were also
7 redesigned. He noted that Phase I would include the apartment buildings and Phase II and Phase
8 III would include mixed-use buildings and the hotel followed by retail and condominiums.

9
10 The Design Guidelines were next discussed. Mr. Davis understood that the ARC was supportive
11 of the design theme and architectural standards. Staff shared a template of design guidelines that
12 included the Wasatch Rock Design Guidelines that have been submitted.

13
14 Scott Schoonover from McNeil Engineering stated that the cul-de-sac was implemented to create
15 a gateway onto Upper Wasatch Boulevard. They now have the opportunity to utilize the
16 roundabout to create landscaping or a focal point to enhance the gateway feel. Walkways were
17 upsized to eight feet to encourage shared traveling. The desire was to provide crosswalks and
18 dress up specific nodes and plaza areas to create outdoor dining areas and patio spaces.

19
20 The entrance into the property was described. Vegetation and an urban trail were proposed.

21
22 Jory Walker from Beecher Walker Architects reported that the first 35 feet of the residential plat
23 includes two-story townhomes with front porches. The idea was to have walkup living with angled
24 parking to slow the pedestrian access down and create a village feel. The pedestrian flow was
25 reviewed. They were anticipating a 50% parking share with the hotel. Visitor parking would be
26 located in front of the mixed-use and parking pulled behind the buildings out of view from the
27 street.

28
29 Commissioner Valentiner asked for clarification as to whether the applicant was asking for
30 approval of a site plan, the project, or the design guidelines. Mr. Taylor explained that staff needs
31 a preliminary plan that will serve as a Master Site Plan to guide future phases of the development.
32 Although optional, staff recommended design themes or supplemental design guidelines to guide
33 each building within each phase. It was noted that the focus of the proposed plans was to provide
34 connectivity in terms of the location of buildings. The plan designs were compared.

35
36 Mr. Johnson confirmed that the Planned Development District (“PDD”) is a rezoning tool that
37 allows an applicant to create an ordinance that is specific to a site. The PDD zone allows more
38 flexibility and greater density than any other underlying zone. Details must be determined upfront
39 and come with a development plan to be incorporated into the approved ordinance. It was noted
40 that staff requires an idea of how the site will operate.

41
42 The applicant stated that they are comfortable going into this level of detail because they are so
43 heavily restricted by site constraints. The land determines where building footprints can exist and
44 throughout the application process, staff has strived to address what the PDD zone is asking for
45 and what they are willing to commit to those details.

Chair Peters commended the applicant for their response to the Commission's requests and providing a connection between buildings, slowing down upper Wasatch Boulevard, and enhancing the pedestrian feel. He was in favor of the townhomes and the proposed front porches. Concern was expressed with the lack of space for trees except for the shared parking islands. It was suggested that the west side of the mixed-use development may benefit from some softening. The open plaza area contains a majority of natural softscape and there is an opportunity for that to be a more active area. Chair Peters recommended a small pony wall along Wasatch Boulevard to provide an aesthetic architectural treatment.

Architectural treatments were discussed at length. The applicant depicted urban mountain and modern materials with the intent of providing warm, rich materials with low lines.

The Commission Members were agreeable to the proposed architectural style and believed it should be continued throughout the site.

Commissioner Henriksen moved to recommend that a Certificate of Design Compliance be issued for Project PDD-19-001 subject to following:

Conditions:

- 1. Contingent on the development of architectural guidelines that will be an overlay to the existing design lines for Cottonwood Heights City.***
- 2. A further review by the Architectural Review Committee shall be required to approve or recommend approval of those design guidelines.***
- 3. Provide a layout of the section through Wasatch Boulevard and adjoining parking areas.***
- 4. Special attention shall be paid to front porches and treatment of any buildings abutting hardscape.***
- 5. Landscaping along the west side of the mixed-use development and hotel area shall be addressed with more detail in the plaza area located in the center of the development with a focus on how to activate that space.***

Mr. Johnson was agreeable to conditional approval since the items are minor. The focus can then be on moving the project on to the Planning Commission. As details come forward, they will be brought back to the ARC.

Commissioner Harman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

2.3 (Project SPL-20-005) Action on a Request by Canyon Centre Residential, LLC for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for an Amended Site Plan and Building Elevations at 7358 South Canyon Centre Parkway.

1
2 Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and stated that the above matter is a request by Canyon
3 Centre Residential, LLC for approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for an amended site
4 plan and building elevations for property located at 7358 South Canyon Centre Parkway. The
5 units reflect an increase from 113 to approximately 140 resulting in a slight expansion of the
6 building footprint. Modifying the footprint will require the ARC to amend the Certificate of
7 Design Compliance. The proposed layout was reviewed. Mr., Johnson explained that the
8 expansion along the northwest corner is located at the intersection of Canyon Center Parkway and
9 Racquet Club Drive. The east elevation view is into the courtyard area where the walkway has
10 been reduced to make space for additional units inside the building. There were no proposed
11 changes to the architectural palette and the entryway canopy was removed with the rooftop deck
12 remaining. He confirmed that the request will be reviewed by the Planning Commission who will
13 consider the impact of adding additional units. Staff recommended approval subject to the
14 following findings:

- 15
16 ▪ The northwest corner has been modified and design guidelines focus on entry features and
17 are well identifiable.
- 18
19 ▪ Glazing on the building wall and heavy materials have been removed and requires
20 discussion.
- 21
22 ▪ The interior courtyard has been reduced. There should be an assurance that it has been
23 designed in accordance with the reduction of the area and not essentially what was
24 presented previously and shrunk down.

25
26 In response to a question raised, Mr. Johnson confirmed that the request is within the parameters
27 of density and explained that in 2014 when originally considered, the density in the Mixed-Use
28 Zone was less and allowed for 12 units per acre as a permitted use and 16 units per acre as a
29 conditional use. The ordinance was changed a short time later to allow up to 35 units per acre as
30 a permitted use.

31
32 The courtyard rendering was displayed. A Commission Member expressed concern with the
33 proposed glass and stated that more could be done to improve the design of the building. He felt
34 that the aesthetics appeared harsh where before it was more inviting.

35
36 Commissioner Valentiner was opposed to the living areas encroaching 20 feet into someone else's
37 window. It appeared compact and lost its originality.

38
39 The applicant described changes made and indicated that the courtyard remains along with the
40 rooftop garden. The scale of the recreation area was not affected by the changes with the exception
41 of the opening that allows access.

42
43 Mr. Johnson reported that from staff's perspective, the density is measured by units per acre. In
44 discussions with the owner, they were able to increase up to 127 units by splitting up units without
45 impacting the site plans. The additional 12 or 13 units to a total of 140 resulted in the proposed
46 changes.

Commissioner Valentiner was excused from the remainder of the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

The project elevations were reviewed at length. It was suggested that the exterior details of the west corner were altered to soften the appearance. Potential alternatives were explored. The applicant expressed concern with delaying approval and the financial strain they would incur.

Mr. Johnson noted that the applicant has not completed the conditional use application which means it will not be heard at the May Planning Commission meeting. He believed that this delay, however, will not impact the timing of the final approval. They have been clear in terms of deadlines and it is not the ARC's role to fit deadlines for payments in the HUD process. It was anticipated that based on deadlines given to the applicant that have not been met, approval will not take place until June. Mr. Johnson reiterated that this will not delay the final decision on increasing the number of units.

Commissioner Oldroyd did not support an informal review of modifications made to the west elevation.

Commissioner Henriksen was comfortable recommending approval of the Certificate of Design Compliance conditional upon reworking the west corner elevations.

Commissioner Breen moved to approve Project SPL-20-005 subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. The applicant shall move forward with suggestions on the northwest corner of the building to be reviewed via email, which may be approved if the necessary steps are taken.***
- 2. If any members of the ARC are not comfortable with the design change along the northwest corner, the matter will be required to return for a formal ARC review.***

Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Commissioner Valentiner was not present for the vote.

3.0 Consent Agenda

3.1 Approval of Minutes for April 23, 2020

Commissioner Harman moved to approve the minutes of April 23, 2020, after the following process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each member of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Breen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

1
2 **4.0 Adjournment**

3
4 *Commissioner Oldroyd moved to adjourn. Commissioner Breen seconded the motion. The*
5 *motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

6
7 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:37 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights Architectural Review Commission Meeting held Thursday, April 23, 2020.*
3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: May 12, 2020